

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claim 26 has been amended. Claims 1-25 have been canceled. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Beauchamp (U.S. Patent No. 6,621,505), hereafter "Beauchamp." Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Butts (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,830), hereafter "Butts," in view of Zarrin (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,731), hereafter "Zarrin." Claims 1-10, 12-15, 17-21 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Beauchamp in view of Zurick "Design Pattern," hereafter "Zurick." Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Beauchamp in view of Zurick and further in view of Hoffmann (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,769) hereafter "Hoffman." Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Beauchamp in view of Zurick and further in view of Butts. Claim 26 has been indicated as being allowable. Applicant gratefully appreciates the indication of allowability.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIM 26 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office has asserted that claim 26 is indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office states that the terms "the internet" and "the proprietary screen definition" lack proper antecedent basis. In response, Applicant has amended claim 26 to recite "[a] method for accessing a legacy computer application over an Internet..." and "...converting a proprietary screen definition to a converted user interface." The Office further states that certain terms in the claim are not clearly understood. In response, Applicant has amended claim 26 to recite "...parsing the proprietary screen definition associated with the legacy computer application..."; "...the client and the computer being connected by a server..."; and "...no code changes are made to programs of the legacy computer application." Applicant asserts that these amendments further clarify the invention. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.


B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-25 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 1-25, Applicant has canceled claims 1-25 and elected to take the allowed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant submits that all claims in condition for allowance.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald A. D'Alessandro
Reg. No.: 42,456

Date: August 1, 2005

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
Three E-Comm Square
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

RAD/hew